

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11-19, 22-35 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 5, 8, 11-16, 19, 22-26, 29-31. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 2, 6, 9, 10, 20, and 21. No new claims have been added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on September 24, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Zaslavsky. The amendments and the discussion herein are based upon that interview. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0007] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0008] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 5, 8, 11-16, 19, 22-26, and 29-31 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0010] Claim 1 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 2. Claim 5 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 6. Claim 8 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 9 and 10. Claim 19 is amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 20 and 21.

Support for the amendment to the claim 29 is found in the specification [0032] and [0064]. Support for the amendment to claim 31 is found in [0047], [0048] and 214 of Figure 2.

Formal Matters

Claim Objections

[0011] The Examiner objects to Claims 1 and 5 due to informalities which required appropriate correction. The claims are amended herein to address the informalities.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112

[0012] The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11-19, and 22-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirements. Based upon the amendments herein, the Applicant submits that this rejection is no longer applicable. Specifically, the term “multiplexing” (and other related terms) is removed and instead the claims specifically describe what is occurring without using that terminology.

Claim Rejections under §§ 102 and 103

[0013] The Examiner rejects claims 31, 34, and 35 under §102. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not shown that cited references anticipate the rejected claims.

[0014] In addition, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15-19, 22, 25-30, 32, and 33 under §103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0015] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and §103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0016] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone and in combination:

- **Zaslavsky:** *Zaslavsky, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0014752 A1 (published date January 16, 2003);
- **Gordon:** *Gordon, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,481,012 B1 (issued November 12, 2002); and
- **Norsworthy:** *Norsworthy et al.*, US Patent No. 6,784,945 B2 (issued August 31, 2004).

Overview of the Application

[0017] The Application describes a technology for facilitating a presentation of multiple miniaturized video feeds to a multimedia receiver. It further facilitates a user-interface employing multiple miniaturized video feeds to a multimedia receiver.

Cited References

[0018] The Examiner cites Zaslavsky as the primary reference in the anticipation- and obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Gordon and Norsworthy as secondary references in the obviousness-based rejections.

Zaslavsky

[0019] Zaslavsky describes a method for operating a decoder. The method comprises receiving, on a first channel, an electronic program guide data stream comprising multiple video streams which have been encoded and multiplexed for transmission on the first channel, each video stream comprising a low resolution version of a high resolution video stream which is being simultaneously received on a separate channel; decoding the electronic program guide data stream into frames, each frame defining a mosaic-style image comprising image areas for images in the electronic program guide data stream corresponding to images from each of the multiple video streams; and displaying each of the frames on a display screen coupled to the decoder.

Gordon

[0020] Gordon describes a method for slice-based encoding of program guides and user interfaces. The program guides include multiple video streams for picture-in-picture and other applications. A method for encoding the program guide includes encoding a first set of slices for each of a plurality of graphics pages; and encoding a second set of slices for each of a plurality of video

streams. The user interfaces are multi-functional and may be used for electronic commerce and other applications. A method of generating the user interface includes encoding a set of slices for each of a plurality of objects, each object being characterized by an identity, at least one attribute, and at least one operation.

Norsworthy

[0021] Norsworthy describes a multiple information decoding system and method in which multiple information content is decoded sequentially and provided to a viewer such that the viewer perceives the information content as being simultaneously decoded. One embodiment of the system and method is in a video display system where RF channels are decoded by a single tuner for concurrent presentation to a display.

Anticipation Rejections

[0022] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

Based upon Zaslavsky

[0023] The Examiner rejects claims 31, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zaslavsky. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 31

[0024] Applicant submits that Zaslavsky does not anticipate this claim because it does not show or disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- the UI comprising multiple "thumbnail" display areas, **each area configured to display a reduced-scale ("thumbnail") video feed**

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

received, in response to a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area, via a communications network.

[0025] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 6) the following with regard to this claim:

11. In regards to Claim 31, Zaslavsky teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (hardware 1700, as described in Paragraph [0141]) that, when executed by a computer (CPU 200 as described in Paragraph [0096] Lines 9-11), produce a user-interface (UI) of a multimedia system, the UI comprising multiple "thumbnail" display areas (interface block 803 of Fig. 14, as described in Paragraph [0135]), each area configured to display a non-multiplexed reduced-scale ("thumbnail") video feed received, in response to a request, via a communications network (display areas are shown as any one of elements 810a-f, as described in Paragraph [0135]. In addition, "User input selecting "channel" for textural mapping" received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142]. With further reference to "downloading the video signals into a pixel memory", as disclosed in Paragraph [0107]).

[0026] In this Action, the Examiner equates the "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" disclosed by Zaslavsky with "in response to a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area" as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0027] Zaslavsky describes how a display area shows any one of elements 810 a-f as described in paragraph [0135]. In addition, Zaslavsky describes a "user input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input

circuit 1708”, in paragraph [0141] and “CPU 200 reads the signals provided by remote control device 150, and controls the images displayed on video screen 102 in response thereto”, in paragraph [0097]. Although paragraphs [0135], [0141] and [0097] may indicate that a user selects a channel, it does not state that the thumbnail video feed of each area is displayed in response to a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area, as required by claim 31.

[0028] Consequently, Zaslavsky does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features in this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 32-35

[0029] Dependent claims 32 and 33 are rejected by the Examiner based on § 103. Dependent claims 34 and 35 are rejected by the Examiner based on §102. These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 31. As discussed above, claim 31 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0030] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Zaslavsky and Norsworthy

[0031] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15-19, 22, 25-30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaslavsky in view of Norsworthy. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0032] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **receiving a request for a plurality** of the thumbnail video feeds;
- **in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality** of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network;

[0033] The Examiner relies upon Zaslavsky to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, pp. 7-8) the following with regard to this claim:

“receiving a request for a plurality of thumbnail video feeds (“User input selecting ‘channel’ for textural mapping” received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142].”

[0034] In this Action, the Examiner equates the “User input selecting ‘channel’ for textural mapping” disclosed by Zaslavsky with “receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds and in response to the request concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds” as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0035] Zaslavsky describes how a “user input selecting ‘channel’ for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input circuit 1708”, as disclosed in paragraph [0141] and that the size converted or reduced streams are multiplexed into a single stream and transmitted to a plurality of receiver circuits, as in paragraph [0142]. Although paragraphs [0141-0142] may indicate that a single stream containing multiple reduced streams in being transmitted, it does not state that the plurality was requested, and that in response to this request, the requested plurality was transmitted.

[0036] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately** from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network;

[0037] The Examiner relies upon Norsworthy to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8) the following with regards to this claim:

In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams using Tuner 11 for video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62, with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55.

[0038] Applicant submits that Norsworthy does not disclose, teach or suggest, "transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately". Instead, Norsworthy shows, "a TV system in which a user watches (and listens) to one channel (the main channel) and several other channels are presented (without audio) concurrently on the screen." (Column 2, lines 4-7). Never does Norsworthy teach or suggest separately transmitting more than one audio feed.

[0039] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky and Norsworthy does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 3, 4

[0040] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 5

[0041] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **receiving a request for a plurality** of the thumbnail video feeds;
- **in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality** of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network;

[0042] The Examiner relies upon Zaslavsky to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 9) the following with regard to this claim:

"receiving a request for a plurality of thumbnail video feeds ("User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142]."

[0043] In this Action, the Examiner equates the "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" disclosed by Zaslavsky with "receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds and in response to the request

concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds” as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0044] Zaslavsky describes how a “user input selecting ‘channel’ for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input circuit 1708”, as disclosed in paragraph [0141] and that the size converted or reduced streams are multiplexed into a single stream and transmitted to a plurality of receiver circuits, as in paragraph [0142]. Although paragraphs [0141-0142] may indicate that a single stream containing multiple reduced streams in being transmitted, it does not state that the plurality was requested, and that in response to this request, the requested plurality was transmitted.

[0045] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately** from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network;

[0046] The Examiner relies upon Norsworthy to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8) the following with regards to this claim:

In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams using Tuner 11 for video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62; with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55.

[0047] Applicant submits that Norsworthy does not disclose, teach or suggest, "transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately". Instead, Norsworthy shows, "a TV system in which a user watches (and listens) to one channel (the main channel) and several other channels are presented (without audio) concurrently on the screen." (Column 2, lines 4-7). Never does Norsworthy teach or suggest separately transmitting more than one audio feed.

[0048] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky and Norsworthy does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 7

[0049] This claim ultimately depend upon the independent claim previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 5 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of this claim may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 8

[0050] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds** ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network;

[0051] The Examiner relies upon Zaslavsky to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 11) the following with regard to this claim:

"performs a method comprising receiving, in response to a request, a plurality of non-multiplexed scaled –reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network (broadcast channel 410 of Fig. 10 as described in Paragraph [0128], showing multiple reduced scale thumbnail video feeds 1-100 and 101-x. In addition, "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142]."

[0052] In this Action, the Examiner equates the "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" disclosed by Zaslavsky with "in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds" as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0053] Zaslavsky describes how a "user input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input circuit 1708", as disclosed in paragraph [0141] and that the size converted or reduced streams are multiplexed into a

single stream and transmitted to a plurality of receiver circuits, as in paragraph [0142]. Although paragraphs [0141-0142] may indicate that a single stream containing multiple reduced streams in being transmitted, it does not state that the plurality was requested, and that in response to this request, the requested plurality was received.

[0054] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately** from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds;

[0055] The Examiner relies upon Norsworthy to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8) the following with regards to this claim:

In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams using Tuner 11 for video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62; with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55.

[0056] Applicant submits that Norsworthy does not disclose, teach or suggest, "receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately". Instead, Norsworthy

shows, "a TV system in which a user watches (and listens) to one channel (the main channel) and several other channels are presented (without audio) concurrently on the screen." (Column 2, lines 4-7). Never does Norsworthy teach or suggest separately receiving more than one audio feed.

[0057] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky and Norsworthy does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 11, 15-18

[0058] These claims ultimately depend upon the independent claim previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 8 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 19

[0059] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds** ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network;

[0060] The Examiner relies upon Zaslavsky to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, pp. 14-15) the following with regard to this claim:

"receiving, in response to a request, one or more plurality of non-multipled scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network (broadcast channel 410 of Fig. 10 as described in Paragraph [0128], showing multiple reduced scale thumbnail video feeds 1-100 and 101-x. In addition, "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142]."

[0061] In this Action, the Examiner equates the "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" disclosed by Zaslavsky with "in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds" as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0062] Zaslavsky describes how a "user input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input circuit 1708", as disclosed in paragraph [0141] and that the size converted or reduced streams are multiplexed into a single stream and transmitted to a plurality of receiver circuits, as in paragraph [0142]. Although paragraphs [0141-0142] may indicate that a single stream containing multiple reduced streams in being transmitted, it does not state that the plurality was requested, and that in response to this request, the requested plurality was received.

[0063] Applicant submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- **receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately** from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds;

[0064] The Examiner relies upon Norsworthy to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8) the following with regards to this claim:

In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams using Tuner 11 for video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62; with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55.

[0065] Applicant submits that Norsworthy does not disclose, teach or suggest, "receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately". Instead, Norsworthy shows, "a TV system in which a user watches (and listens) to one channel (the main channel) and several other channels are presented (without audio) concurrently on the screen." (Column 2, lines 4-7). Never does Norsworthy teach or suggest separately receiving more than one audio feed.

[0066] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky and Norsworthy does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 22, 25-28

[0067] These claims ultimately depend upon the independent claim previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 19 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 29

[0068] Applicant submits that the combination of references does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- a receiving unit configured for concurrently receiving, **without any tuners** and in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds"),

[0069] None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest, "without any tuners" as disclosed in Claim 29. With all of the cited references, a tuner (or multiple tuners) are required. See, for example, Zaslavsky paragraph [0127], Norsworthy Fig. 1, 3, 6, and 9 and Column 1 lines 63-67 to Column 2 lines 1-23, and Gordon Fig. 14 and Column 13 lines 11-24.

[0070] Applicant further submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- a receiving unit configured for **concurrently receiving**, without any tuners and **in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds** ("thumbnail video feeds")

[0071] The Examiner relies upon Zaslavsky to teach the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 17) the following with regard to this claim:

"receiving, in response to a request, a plurality of non-multiplexed scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network (broadcast channel 410 of Fig. 10 as described in Paragraph [0128], showing multiple reduced scale thumbnail video feeds 1-100 and 101-x. In addition, "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" received by input circuit 1708 of Fig. 17, also see Fig. 18 and Paragraph [0141-0142]."

[0072] In this Action, the Examiner equates the "User input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping" disclosed by Zaslavsky with "concurrently receiving, without any tuners and in response to a request, a plurality of scale-reduced video feeds", as recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0073] Zaslavsky describes how a "user input selecting 'channel' for textural mapping, etc. is received via an input circuit 1708", as disclosed in paragraph [0141] and that the size converted or reduced streams are multiplexed into a single stream and transmitted to a plurality of receiver circuits, as in paragraph [0142]. Although paragraphs [0141-0142] may indicate that a single stream

containing multiple reduced streams in being transmitted, it does not state that in response to this request, a requested plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds was received.

[0074] Applicant further submits that neither Zaslavsky nor Norsworthy (alone or in combination) disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- a receiving unit configured for **concurrently receiving**, without any tuners and in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") **and a plurality of audio feeds separately** from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communication network;

[0075] The Examiner relies upon Norsworthy to teach the above claimed features. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8) the following with regards to this claim:

In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams using Tuner 11 for video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62; with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55.

[0076] Applicant submits that Norsworthy does not disclose, teach or suggest, “concurrently receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately”. Instead, Norsworthy shows, “a TV system in which a user watches (and listens) to one channel (the main channel) and several other channels are presented (without audio) concurrently on the screen.” (Column 2, lines 4-7). Never does Norsworthy teach or suggest more than one audio feed.

[0077] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky and Norsworthy does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 30

[0078] This claim ultimately depends upon the independent claim previously listed. As discussed above, independent claims 29 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of this claim may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Based upon Zaslavsky, Norsworthy and Gordon

[0079] The Examiner rejects claims 12, 13, 14, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaslavsky and Norsworthy as applied to Claims 8 and 19 above, and in further view of Gordon. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Dependent Claims 12-14, 23, and 24

[0080] Applicant submits that the combination of Zaslavsky, Norsworthy and Gordon does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements and features as recited in dependent claims 12-14, 23 and 24 (with emphasis added):

- requesting a **full-scale** version of a select one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds;

[0081] The Examiner relies upon Gordon to teach the above claimed features. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 21) the following with regard to these claims:

In a similar field of invention, Gordon teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Gordon's method further comprises "interacting with an object by selecting it to activate a full-resolution broadcast channel" (as disclosed in Col. 24 Lines 11-14). Following the selection in the thumbnail view (shown as CH-E of Fig 28), the display changes to a full-resolution view (display 2802 of Fig 28) of the video broadcast for channel E (as disclosed in Col. 24 Lines 14-19).

[0082] Applicant submits that Gordon does not disclose, teach or suggest "a full-scale version of a select one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds". Instead, Gordon shows the display changing to a full-resolution view, "interacting with an object by selecting it to activate a full-resolution broadcast channel". See Gordon Col 24 lines 11-13 and display 2802 of Fig. 28.

[0083] The Examiner provides no objective evidence, from Gordon or any other reference, as to why a person having ordinary skill in the art would equate Gordon's full resolution disclosure with a full-scale version as recited in the claims.

[0084] As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky, Norsworthy and Gordon does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims

[0085] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0086] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10/02/2008

By: /kaseychristie40559/

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com